

## REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, claim 4 has been canceled, claims 1, 3, 12, 22, and 23 have been amended, and new claims 27 and 28 have been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

### *Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103*

At paragraphs 4-18 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8-13, and 17-22 as being unpatentable over Patent Application Publication 2001/0011308 to Clark et al. (“Clark”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,887,063 to Varadharajan et al. (“Varadharajan”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,600,800 to Kikinis et al. (“Kikinis”).

As applied to claim 1, the Examiner relied largely on paragraph 60 of Clark to show all of the claimed features of claim 1 except for (1) enabling decryption of encrypted data from the portable computer system provided the identity is authorized and disabling decryption if the identity is not authorized; and (2) transferring authentication from the communication interface device to the portable computer. The teachings of Varadharajan and Kikinis were relied upon to show items (1) and (2), respectively.

Applicants submit that the teachings of Clark are deficient in other respects beyond items (1) and (2) noted above.

Here, Applicants note that Clark teaches synchronization in two different contexts. The first context is where the handheld is in the cradle and automatic synchronization occurs. *See*, paragraph 11 of Clark. The second context is during remote operation, which is described as follows:

It is understood that the host computer can be a standalone unit in which case a modem is directly dialed, or wireless interface is accessed or it could be a network computer in which case the handheld computer H also passes certain password and sign-on information as necessary. In this case for remote operation it is advisable to have two levels of password security, one to allow access to only the shared files or common files between the user designated location and the handheld computer H and a second

level of password to allow greater access to the system. In any case it is considered desirable to have the handheld computer H include its serial number as an initial password or qualifier, with the host computer allowing synchronization access to only registered or previously stored serial numbers.

*See*, paragraph 60 of Clark. As noted, it is in the context of remote operation that identifying information for the handheld computer is provided. This is evident by the usage of the serial number as an initial password to the host computer, not a cradle, when requesting synchronization access. Accordingly, Clark cannot teach element (a) of claim 1, which recites “automatically receiving identification authentication information for said portable computer system *at a communication interface device* embodied as a cradle for said portable computer system, wherein said authentication information comprises a unique identity for said portable computer system.”

Moreover, since Clark teaches the provision of identifying information in the context of remote operation, Clark cannot teach element (b) of claim 1, which recites “comparing *at said communication interface device* said identification authentication information with a list of authorized portable computer system identities,” element (c) of claim 1, which recites “determining *at said communication interface device* whether said portable computer system identity is authorized based on said identification authentication information and said unique identity,” and element (d) of claim 1, which recites “enabling *at said communication interface device* communication between said portable computer system and said other computer provided said identity is authorized and disabling said communication if said identity is not authorized.

Even assuming that Varadharajan teaches all that the Examiner alleges with respect to encryption, the combination of Clark and Varadharajan would not teach element (e) of claim 1, which recites “enabling *at said communication interface device* decryption of encrypted data from said portable computer system provided said identity is authorized and disabling decryption if said identity is not authorized.”

Finally, even assuming that Kikinis teaches all that the Examiner alleges, the deficiencies of Clark and Varadharajan still remain.

For at least these reasons, the rejection of claim 1 is traversed. Independent claims 10 and 21 contain at least some of the elements described above with respect to claim 1. The

rejection of those claims is also traversed for at least some of the reasons noted above. Since claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 17-20, and 22 are dependent either directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1, 10, and 20, the rejection of claims 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11-13, 17-20, and 22 is also traversed for at least the reasons noted above.

At paragraphs 19-20 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 7 as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Varadharajan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,825 to Frederick. Since claim 7 is dependent from independent claim 1 and incorporates the features of claim 1, the rejection of claim 7 is traversed for at least those reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

At paragraphs 21-22 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 14 as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Varadharajan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,593,353 to Pickholtz. Since claim 14 is dependent from independent claim 10 and incorporates the features of claim 10, the rejection of claim 14 is traversed for at least those reasons noted above with respect to claim 10.

At paragraphs 23-24 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 15 as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Varadharajan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,239,166 to Graves. Since claim 15 is dependent from independent claim 10 and incorporates the features of claim 10, the rejection of claim 15 is traversed for at least those reasons noted above with respect to claim 10.

At paragraphs 25-26 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 16 as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Varadharajan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,480,101 to Kelly. Since claim 16 is dependent from independent claim 10 and incorporates the features of claim 10, the rejection of claim 16 is traversed for at least those reasons noted above with respect to claim 10.

At paragraphs 27-29 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 23 and 25 as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Kikinis. As noted above, Clark teaches the concept of identifying information in the context of remote operation. This is evident by the usage of the serial number as an initial password to the host computer, not a cradle, when requesting synchronization access. Accordingly, Clark cannot teach a communication interface module separate from the host computer system for coupling between the communication ports of the portable electronic device and the host computer system, the communication interface module comprising: an authentication device for authenticating the identity reference; and a communication interface circuit coupled to the authentication device and for allowing direct communication between the portable electronic device and the host computer system provided the authentication device indicates a proper authentication of the identity reference.

Kikinis also does not make up for the deficiencies of Clark because it is focused on host computers that receive PDA in PCMCIA form into docking ports in the host computer. Accordingly, separate communication interface modules are not contemplated.

Moreover, it should be noted that the Examiner has not addressed the features of claim 23 that relate to the authorization of decryption services.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 23 is traversed. Since claim 25 is dependent from independent claim 23 and incorporates the features of claim 23, the rejection of claim 25 is traversed for at least those reasons noted above with respect to claim 23.

At paragraphs 30-31 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 24 as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Kikinis and further in view of Varadharajan. For at least those reasons noted above with respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 24 is traversed.

At paragraphs 32-33 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 26 as being unpatentable over Clark in view of Kikinis and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,286,099 to Kramer. Since claim 26 is dependent from independent claim 23 and incorporates the features of

claim 23, the rejection of claim 26 is traversed for at least those reasons noted above with respect to claim 23.

***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might be useful for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: June 17, 2005

By: /Reena Kuyper/  
Reena Kuyper  
Reg. No. 33,830

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810  
Los Angeles, CA 90069  
(310) 247-2860